arXiv:1403.5918v1 [math.PR] 24 Mar 2014

EXACT ASYMPTOTICS FOR THE INSTANT OF CROSSING A CURVE BOUNDARY BY AN ASYMPTOTICALLY STABLE RANDOM WALK

DENIS DENISOV AND VITALI WACHTEL

Abstract. Suppose that $\{S_n,\ n \geq 0\}$ is an asymptotically stable random walk. Let g be a positive function and T_g be the first time when S_n leaves $[-g(n), \infty)$. In this paper we study asymptotic behaviour of T_g. We provide integral tests for function g that guarantee $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \sim V(g)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)$ where T_0 is the first strict descending ladder epoch of $\{S_n\}$.

1. Introduction and main results

Consider a one-dimensional random walk

$$S_0 = 0,\ S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n,\ n \geq 1,$$

where $X, X_1, X_2, \ldots$ are i.i.d. random variables. Let $g(t)$ be an increasing function and consider the exit time from the domain bounded by $-g(t)$, that is,

$$T_g := \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n < -g(n)\}.$$

The aim of this paper is to study the asymptotics $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)$ as n goes to infinity.

This question has been thoroughly good studied in the case of constant boundary, that is, $g(n) \equiv x \geq 0$. In particular, it is well-known that if

$$\mathbf{P}(S_n \geq 0) \to \rho \in (0,1), \quad n \to \infty \tag{1}$$

then

$$\mathbf{P}(T_x > n) \sim h(x) n^{\rho - 1} L(n), \quad n \to \infty, \tag{2}$$

where $L(n)$ is a slowly varying function. (Slightly abusing notation, we write T_x for T_g in the case when $g(t) \equiv x$. We also write $a(x) \sim b(x)$ if $a(x)/b(x) \to 1$ as x to infinity.) Function $h(x)$ is the renewal function of the strict decreasing ladder height process.

We now introduce a class of random walks, which will be considered in the present paper. Let

$$\mathcal{A} := \{0 < \alpha < 1;\ |\beta| < 1\} \cup \{1 < \alpha < 2; |\beta| \leq 1\} \cup \{\alpha = 1, \beta = 0\} \cup \{\alpha = 2, \beta = 0\}$$

be a subset in $\mathbb{R}^2$. For $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{A}$ and a random variable X write $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$ if the distribution of X belongs to the domain of attraction of a stable law with characteristic function

$$G_{\alpha,\beta}(t) := \exp\left\{-c|t|^{\,\alpha}\left(1 - i\beta\frac{t}{|t|}\tan\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right)\right\},\ c > 0, \tag{3}$$

and, in addition, $\mathbf{E}X = 0$ if this moment exists. Let $c(x)$ be a positive function specified by the relation

$$c(x) := \inf\left\{u \geq 0 : \mu(u) \leq x^{-1}\right\}, \ x \geq 1, \tag{4}$$

where

$$\mu(u) := \frac{1}{u^2}\int_{-u}^{u} x^2 \mathbf{P}(X \in dx).$$

It is known (see, for instance, [7, Ch. XVII, §5]) that for every $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$ the function $\mu(u)$ is regularly varying with index $(-\alpha)$. This implies that $c(x)$ is regularly varying with index α^{-1}, i.e., there exists a function $l_1(x)$, slowly varying at infinity, such that

$$c(x) = x^{1/\alpha} l_1(x). \tag{5}$$

In addition, the scaled sequence $\{S_n/c(n),\, n \geq 1\}$ converges in distribution to the stable law given by (3). In this case we say that S_n is an *asymptotically stable random walk*. For every $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$ there is an explicit formula for ρ,

$$\rho = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, \ \alpha = 1, \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi\alpha}\arctan\left(\beta \tan\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right), \ \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Since $h(0) = 1$, one can rewrite (2) in a slightly different way:

$$\mathbf{P}(T_x > n) \sim h(x)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n).$$

This representation shows that the asymptotics is the same up to a constant for every fixed x. This statement remains valid for curved boundaries which grow not very fast. For the Brownian motion and monotone increasing function g it was shown in [12] and [14] that

$$0 < \mathbf{E}[|B(T_g^{(bm)})|] < \infty \iff \int_1^\infty g(t)t^{-3/2}dt < \infty \tag{7}$$

and, moreover,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g^{(bm)} > t) \sim \mathbf{E}[B(T_g^{(bm)})]\mathbf{P}(T_1^{(bm)} > t) \text{ as } t \to \infty. \tag{8}$$

Finiteness of the integral in (7) is also necessary: if $\int_1^\infty g(t)t^{-3/2}dt = \infty$ then

$$\mathbf{P}\{T_g^{(bm)} > t\} \gg \mathbf{P}\{T_1^{(bm)} > t\} \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

The case of general random walks and Levy processes was analysed by Greenwood and Novikov in [9], see also Novikov [12, 13]. In Theorem 1 they state that if $\mathbf{E}g(T_0) < \infty$ then there exists $R_g \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \sim R_g \mathbf{P}(T_0 > n) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty. \tag{9}$$

However, recent results by Aurzada and Kramm [2] give strong grounds to suspect that conditions in [9] are not optimal. More precisely, it is shown in [2] that if $g(t) = o(t^\gamma)$ with some $\gamma < 1/\alpha$ then $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)$ and $\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)$ have the same rough asymptotics, that is,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) = n^{\rho - 1 + o(1)} \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

But, in view of (2), $\mathbf{E}g(\tau_0)$ is finite only for $\gamma \leq 1 - \rho < 1/\alpha$.

In this paper we present alternative (and milder than $\mathbf{E}g(T_0) < \infty$) conditions for the validity of (9).

Theorem 1. *Let g be an increasing function such that $h(g(x))$ is subadditive. If* (1) *holds and*

$$\mathbf{E}h(g(T_0)) < \infty \tag{10}$$

then there exists a constant $V(g) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \sim V(g)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n) \sim V(g)n^{\rho-1}L(n), \quad n \to \infty. \tag{11}$$

This result generalises Theorem 1 in Greenwood and Novikov [9] where it was assumed that that g is concave and that $\mathbf{E}g(T_0)$ is finite. Noting that h is subadditive, we conclude that (10) is weaker than the finiteness of $\mathbf{E}g(T_0)$. Moreover, subadditivity of h implies also that $h(g(x))$ is subadditive for every concave function g. And the subadditivity assumption can be further weakened:

Remark 2. The statement of Theorem 1 remains valid if we replace subadditivity of $h(g(x))$ by the existence of a subadditive majorant which satisfy (10). ⋄

We next specialise Theorem 1 to the case of asymptotically stable random walks.

Corollary 3. *Assume that $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$. If*

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{h(g(x))}{xh(c(x))}dx < \infty \tag{12}$$

then (11) *is valid.*

If $\mathbf{E}[(X^-)^2] < \infty$ then, clearly, $h(x) \sim cx$ and, consequently, our condition (12) coincides with Novikov's integral test, see Theorem 1 in [13]. Note also that Novikov [13] imposes a stronger assumption on g: this function is assumed to be concave.

Recalling that h is regularly varying of index $-\alpha(1-\rho)$, we conclude that (11) holds for every function g bounded from above by x^γ with some $\gamma < \min\{1, 1/\alpha\}$. But if $g(x)$ is asymptotically equivalent to $c(x)$ then, applying the functional limit theorem, we conclude that the statement of Corollary 3 is not valid. Therefore, condition (12) is quite close to the optimal one for asymptotically stable random walks.

Remark 4. Mogulskii and Pecherskii [11] have derived the following factorisation identity for T_g: If g is superadditive, i.e., $g(x+y) \geq g(x) + g(y)$, then there exists a sequence of events E_n such that

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty z^n \mathbf{P}(T_g > n) = \exp\left\{\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{z^n}{n}\mathbf{P}(E_n)\right\}. \tag{13}$$

Moreover,

$$E_n \subseteq \{S_n \geq -g(n)\} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1. \tag{14}$$

Unfortunately, the structure of E_n is highly non-trivial and it is not clear how do determine the limit of $\mathbf{P}(E_n)$. But using (14) one can obtain an asymptotically precise upper bound for $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)$. Indeed, it is immediate from (14) that

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \leq q_n,$$

where q_n is determined by

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty z^n q_n = \exp\left\{\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{z^n}{n}\mathbf{P}(S_n \geq -g(n))\right\}.$$

Assume that function g satisfies

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{g(x)}{xc(x)}dx < \infty. \tag{15}$$

Then applying the estimate

$$\mathbf{P}(S_n \in [x, x+1)) \le \frac{C}{c(n)},$$

we conclude that coefficients of

$$R(z) := \exp\left\{\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{z^n}{n}\mathbf{P}(S_n \in [-g(n), 0]\right\}$$

are summable, i.e., $R(1) < \infty$. Noting now that

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty z^n q_n = \left(\sum_{n=0}^\infty z^n \mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)\right) R(z),$$

we arrive at the relation

$$q_n \sim R(1)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)$$

and, consequently,

$$1 \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} \le R(1). \tag{16}$$

Note also that in order to obtain the relation $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \sim C\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)$ from (13) it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n}\left|\mathbf{P}(E_n) - \mathbf{P}(S_n > 0)\right| < \infty.$$

Recalling that h is regularly varying of index $\alpha(1-\rho)$, we conclude that (12) is more restrictive than (15) for all random walks with $\alpha(1-\rho) < 1$. Thus, bounds (16) imply that $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)$ can be of the same order as $\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)$ for functions g which do not satisfy (12). $\diamond$

The starting point of the proof of Theorem 1 is the following simple observation: T_g coincides with one of strict descending ladder epochs of S_n. Let (τ_k, χ_k) be independent copies of $(T_0, -S_{T_0})$. Then

$$T_g = \sum_{k=1}^\nu \tau_k, \tag{17}$$

where

$$\nu := \min\{k \ge 1 : \chi_1 + \cdots + \chi_k > g(\tau_1 + \cdots + \tau_k)\}. \tag{18}$$

Since the tail distribution function of τ's is regularly varying with index $\rho - 1 \in (-1, 0)$, we prove that, for any increasing function g,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} = \mathbf{E}\nu \in [1, \infty]. \tag{19}$$

Thus, to prove Theorem 1 it suffices to show that $\mathbf{E}\nu$ is finite under the conditions of Theorem 1.

The subadditivity assumption in Theorem 1 seems to be purely technical. Unfortunately, we do not know how to remove this restriction. But for asymptotically

stable random walks one can replace (12) by a stronger integral test which allows to derive (11) without subadditivity assumption.

Theorem 5. *Assume that $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$. If g is increasing and*

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{h(g(x))}{xh(c(x/\log x))}dx < \infty, \tag{20}$$

then (11) *remains valid.*

Integral test (20) is fulfilled for any increasing regularly varying with index $\gamma < 1/\alpha$ function g and, consequently, the subadditivity assumption is superflous for such functions. On the other hand, it is not difficult to construct a regularly varying with index $1/\alpha$ function g which satisfies (12) but the integral in (20) becomes infinite.

Our proof of Theorem 5 is based on an appropriate adaption of the method from [4], where we studied the asymptotic behaviour of exit times from cones of multidimensional random walks. The main idea in [4] was to use the classical universality for random walks: If certain moments of a random walk are finite (this means that random walk is sufficiently close to the Brownian motion) then the asymptotics for the exit time of this random walk is the same, up to a constant factor, as for the Brownian motion. In the proof of Theorem 7 we use a completely different type of universality: We fix the distribution of a random walk and look for boundaries g such that T_g and T_0 have the same rate.

Now we turn to exit times from a shrinking domain. Define

$$\widehat{T}_g := \min\{n \geq 1 : S_n < g(n)\}.$$

For $\widehat{T}_g$ one does not have any representation similar to (17). For that reason there is no analogue of Theorem 1 for $\widehat{T}_g$. But one can look at the ratio $\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n)/\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)$ in the following way: If g is positive then

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} = \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n | T_0 > n)$$

and one can try to represent the limit of this conditional probability as a functional of $\{S_n\}$ conditioned to stay nonnegative. To formulate the corresponding result we have to introduce some notation. It is well-known that $h(x)$ is a positive harmonic function for $\{S_n\}$ killed at leaving $[0, \infty)$, that is,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(x + X), x + X > 0] = h(x), \quad x \geq 0.$$

We denote by $\mathbf{P}^h$ the Doob transform of $\mathbf{P}$ by the function h. More precisely, $\mathbf{P}^h$ is the distribution of the Markov chain on $[0, \infty)$ with transition function

$$p^h(x, dy) = \frac{h(y)}{h(x)}\mathbf{P}(x + X \in dy), \quad x, y \geq 0.$$

The following statement is immediate from Lemma 2.5 in Afanasyev, Geiger, Kersting and Vatutin [1].

Proposition 6. *If* (1) *holds then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} = \mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty). \tag{21}$$

Greenwood and Novikov [9, Theorem 2] have shown the existence of the limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g>n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0>n)}$ for random walks with $\mathbf{E}X = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}e^{-\lambda X} < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$. They have also shown that this limit is positive if and only if $\mathbf{E}g(T_0) < \infty$. The information about the positivity of this limit is very important, since if it is zero then the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n)$ remains unknown. Thus, in order to apply Proposition 6 we need to find reasonable conditions for the positivity of $\mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty)$. Since $\mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty) = \mathbf{P}^h(S_k \geq g(k) \text{ for all } k \geq 1)$, we infer that $\mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty)$ for every function g such that $\mathbf{P}^h(S_k < g(k) \text{ i.o.}) = 0$. One has also the reverse implication: if $\mathbf{P}^h(S_k < g(k) \text{ i.o.}) = 1$ then $\mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty) = 0$.

By Theorem 1 in Hambly, Kersting and Kyprianou [10] if $\mathbf{E}X^2 < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}X = 0$ then

$$\mathbf{P}^h(S_k < g(k) \text{ i.o.}) = 0 \text{ or } 1 \quad \text{accordingly as} \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{g(x)}{x^{3/2}}dx < \infty \text{ or } = \infty. \tag{22}$$

Consequently, for any oscillating random walk with finite variance,

$$\mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \int_1^\infty \frac{g(x)}{x^{3/2}}dx < \infty.$$

Unfortunately, we did not find results similar to (22) for random walks with infinite variance. Thus, we do not have any criterion for the positivity of $\mathbf{P}^h(\widehat{T}_g = \infty)$ for oscillating random walks with infinite variance.

It turns out that the approach used in Theorem 5 can be applied to $\widehat{T}_g$ as well.

Theorem 7. *Assume that $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$ and that (20) holds. Then there exists $\widehat{V}(g) \in (0, \infty)$ such that, as $n \to \infty$,*

$$\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n) \sim \widehat{V}(g)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n). \tag{23}$$

2. Proof of Theorem 1

We first derive (19). If $\mathbf{E}\nu$ is finite then the desired relation follows immediately from Theorem 2 in Greenwood and Monroe [8]. Assume that $\mathbf{E}\nu = \infty$. Since τ is positive,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \geq \mathbf{P}(\sum_{k=1}^{\nu\wedge m} \tau_k > n)$$

for any $m \geq 1$. Applying Theorem 2 from [8] to the stopping time $\nu \wedge m$, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(T_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} \geq \mathbf{E}[\nu \wedge m].$$

Letting m go to infinity, we complete the derivation of (19).

As it was already mentioned in the introduction, Theorem 1 follows from (19) and the following statement.

Proposition 8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\mathbf{E}\nu < \infty. \tag{24}$$

2.1. **Proof of Proposition 8 for random walks with $\mathbf{E}\chi = \infty$.** It follows from the subadditivity of $h(g(x))$ that

$$\nu \le \mu := \min\{k \ge 1 : h(\chi_1 + \ldots + \chi_k) > h(g(\tau_1)) + \ldots + h(g(\tau_k))\}.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that the expectation of μ is finite. But the latter is a consequence of the positiv recurrence of zero for the sequence

$$Z_n := \left(Z_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} h(g(\tau_k)) - h\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \chi_k \right) \right)^+, \quad n \ge 1.$$

According to Lemma 1 and Proposition in Erickson [6], our assumption $\mathbf{E}\chi = \infty$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{E}h(\chi) = \infty$. Consequently,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(y + \chi) - h(y)] = \infty$$

for every $y \ge 0$. Combining this with (10), we finally get

$$\mathbf{E}[h(y + \chi) - h(y) - h(g(\tau))] = \infty \tag{25}$$

for every $y \ge 0$.

Fix some positive x and y such that $x > h(y)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left[Z_{n+1} - Z_n \Big| \sum_{k=1}^{n} h(g(\tau_k)) = x, \sum_{k=1}^{n} \chi_k = y \right] \\ \le \mathbf{E}[h(y) - h(y + \chi) + h(g(\tau)); x + h(g(\tau)) - h(y + \chi) > 0] \\ = -\mathbf{E}[h(y + \chi) - h(y) - h(g(\tau)); h(y + \chi) - h(y) - h(g(\tau)) < x - h(y)]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (25), we conclude that there exists $A > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}\left[Z_{n+1} - Z_n \Big| \sum_{k=1}^{n} h(g(\tau_k)) = x, \sum_{k=1}^{n} \chi_k = y \right] \le -1$$

for all x, y satisfying $x - h(y) > A$. This implies that the hitting time of $[0, A]$ by the sequence Z_n has finite mean. Since 0 can be approached from any point of $[0, A]$ in a finite time, we infer that $\mathbf{E}\mu < \infty$.

2.2. **Proof of Proposition 8 for random walks with $\mathbf{E}\chi < \infty$.** If random walk S_n is such that $\mathbf{E}\chi < \infty$ then $h(x) \sim Cx$ as $x \to \infty$ and, in particular, $\mathbf{E}h(\chi) < \infty$. Therefore, we can not use the sequence Z_n from the previous subsection. Fix some $k \ge 1$ and consider

$$Z^{(k)} := \chi_1 + \chi_2 + \ldots + \chi_k - g(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + ... + \tau_k)$$

and let $Z_i^{(k)}$ be independent copies of Z. Using the subadditivity of g once again, one can easily show that

$$\nu \le k\mu^{(k)},$$

where

$$\mu^{(k)} := \min\{n \ge 1 : Z_1^{(k)} + Z_2^{(k)} + \ldots + Z_n^{(k)} > 0\}.$$

From this we conclude that Proposition 8 will follow from the existence of k such that $\mathbf{E}Z^{(k)} > 0$. Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \mathbf{E} g(\tau_1 + \tau_2 + ... + \tau_k) = 0. \tag{26}$$

Set $U_k = \tau_1 + \tau_2 + ... + \tau_k$ and note that $\tau_i \in \mathcal{D}(1-\rho, 1)$. Let $a(k)$ be the corresponding norming sequence, that is, $U_k/a(k)$ converges weakly towards a stable distribution of index $1-\rho$.

Since g is increasing and sublinear,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}g(U_k) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}[g(U_k); U_k \in [ja(k), (j+1)a(k))] \\ &\leq g(a(k)) + 2\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g(ja(k))\mathbf{P}(U_k > ja(k)).\end{aligned}$$

Since the tail of τ is regularly varying with index $\rho - 1 > -1$,

$$\mathbf{P}(U_k > x) \leq Ck\mathbf{P}(\tau > x), \quad x \geq 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}g(U_k) &\leq g(a(k)) + C\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} g(ja(k))k\mathbf{P}(\tau > ja(k)) \\ &\leq g(a(k)) + Ck\mathbf{E}[g(\tau); \tau > a(k)]. \qquad (27)\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the assumption $\mathbf{E}g(\tau) < \infty$ that

$$\frac{g(a_k)}{k} \leq Cg(a_k)\mathbf{P}(\tau > a(k)) \leq C\mathbf{E}[g(\tau); \tau > a(k)].$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbf{E}[g(\tau); \tau > a(k)] \to 0 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.$$

Applying these relations to (27), we get (26). This completes the proof of Proposition 8.

2.3. **Proof of Corollary 3.** It suffices to show that (10) and (12) are equivalent. First we note that if $X \in \mathcal{D}(\alpha, \beta)$ then

$$\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 > x) \sim C\frac{1}{h(c(x))} \quad \text{as } x \to \infty$$

and, consequently, (12) is equivalent to

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{h(g(x))}{x}\mathbf{P}(\tau_1 > x)dx < \infty.$$

Consequently,

$$(12) \text{ is equivalent to } \quad \mathbf{E}h(g(\tau_1)) < \infty.$$

3. Proof of Theorem 5

3.1. **Finiteness of $V(g)$.** Let h be the renewal function of the decreasing ladder height process. It is known that it is harmonic for S_n killed at leaving $\mathbb{R}^+$, that is,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(x + X_1); x + X_1 > 0] = h(x), \quad x > 0.$$

Extending $h(x)$ to the negative half line with 0 we can write this equality as $\mathbf{E}h(x + X_1) = h(x)$ for $x > 0$.

Lemma 9. *The sequence $Y_n = h(S_n + g(n))1\{T_g > n\}$ is a submartingale.*

Proof. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\left[Y_{n+1}-Y_n|\mathcal{F}_n\right] = \mathbf{E}\left[\left(h(S_{n+1}+g(n+1))-h(S_n+g(n))\right)1\{T_g>n\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\\ -\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n+1}+g(n+1))1\{T_g=n+1\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right].\end{aligned}$$

Now note that $h(S_{n+1}+g(n+1))1\{T_g=n+1\}=0$ since $h(x)=0$ for $x\le 0$. Next, by harmonicity of h

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{E}\left[Y_{n+1}-Y_n|\mathcal{F}_n\right]\\ &\quad=\mathbf{E}\left[\left(h(S_{n+1}+g(n+1))\right)1\{T_g>n\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]-h(S_n+g(n))1\{T_g>n\}\\ &\quad=h(S_n+g(n+1))1\{T_g>n\}-h(S_n+g(n))1\{T_g>n\}\ge 0,\end{aligned}$$

since h and g are monotone increasing. □

Fix any positive sequence $\varepsilon_n\to 0$ and denote

$$\nu_n := \min\{k\ge 1 : |S_k|\ge c(\varepsilon_n n)\}.$$

Lemma 10. *There exists a constant C such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(\nu_n>\delta n)\le e^{-C\delta/\varepsilon_n}$$

for all $\delta>0$.

Proposition 11. *Assume that g is such that $g(0)>0$ and condition (12) holds. Then there exists a finite strictly positive limit*

$$V(g)=\lim_n \mathbf{E}\left[h(S(n)+g(n));T_g>n\right]<\infty.$$

Proof. Since $h(S(n)+g(n))1\{T_g>n\}$ is a submartingale it is sufficient to show that

$$\sup_n \mathbf{E}\left[h(S(n)+g(n));T_g>n\right]<\infty.$$

By the well-known submartingale convergence theorem this will imply the statement of the proposition.

Fix some $n_0>1$ and define

$$n_m = n_0[(1/\delta)^m],\quad m\ge 1,$$

where $[r]$ denotes the integer part of r. Since $h(S_n+g(n))1\{T_g>n\}$ is a positive submartingale, it suffices to show that the subsequence $\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m));T_g>n_m]$ is bounded. We first split the expectation into 2 parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m));T_g>n_m] &= E_1+E_2\\ &:= \mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m));T_g>n_m,\nu_{n_m}\le n_{m-1}\right]\\ &\quad+\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m));T_g>n_m,\nu_{n_m}>n_{m-1}\right].\end{aligned}$$

For fixed n let

$$\widetilde{\tau}(g(n)) := \min\{k\ge 1 : S_k+g(n)\le 0\}.$$

For the second expectation note

$$E_2=\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m))1\{T_g>n_m\}\mid\mathcal{F}_{n_{m-1}}\right]1\{\nu_{n_m}>n_{m-1}\}\right].$$

Then, using the harmonicity of h,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m))1\{T_g>n_m\}\mid \mathcal{F}_{n_{m-1}}\right]\\
&\qquad\le \mathbf{E}_{S_{n_{m-1}}}[h(S_{n_m-n_{m-1}}+g(n_m))1\{\widetilde{\tau}(g(n_m))>n_m-n_{m-1}\}]1\{T_g>n_{m-1}\}\\
&\qquad\le h(S_{n_{m-1}}+g(n_m))\\
&\qquad\le h(S_{n_{m-1}}+g(n_{m-1}))+h(g(n_m)),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the subadditivity of the renewal function in the last step. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2&\le \mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}})+g(n_{m-1}))+h(g(n_m));\nu_{n_m}>n_{m-1}]\\
&\le \mathbf{E}\left[h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m)+g(n_m))+h(g(n_m));\nu_{n_m}>n_{m-1}\right]\\
&\le \left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))+2h(g(n_m))\right)\mathbf{P}(\nu_{n_m}>n_{m-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 9 with $\varepsilon_n:=(3\delta C\log n)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$E_2\le \left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))+2h(g(n_m))\right)n_m^{-3}.$$

The first expectation can be estimated similarly. First note

$$E_1=\mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m))1\{T_g>n_m\}\mid\mathcal{F}_{\nu_{n_m}}\right],\nu_{n_m}\le n_{m-1}\right].$$

Then, again, using the harmonicity of h,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m))1\{T_g>n_m\}\mid \mathcal{F}_{\nu_{n_m}}\right]\\
&\qquad\le \mathbf{E}_{S_{\nu_{n_m}}}[h(S_{n_m-\nu_{n_m}}+g(n_m))1\{\widetilde{\tau}(g(n_m))>n_m-\nu_{n_m}\}]1\{T_g>\nu_{n_m}\}\\
&\qquad\le h(S_{\nu_{n_m}}+g(n_m))1\{T_g>\nu_{n_m}\}\\
&\qquad\le \left(h(S_{\nu_{n_m}}+g(\nu_{n_m}))+h(g(n_m))\right)1\{T_g>\nu_{n_m}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now since $S_{\nu_n}\ge c(\varepsilon_n n)$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m))1\{T_g>n_m\}\mid\mathcal{F}_{\nu_{n_m}}\right]\\
&\qquad\le h(S_{\nu_{n_m}}+g(\nu_{n_m}))\left(1+\frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))}\right)1\{T_g>\nu_{n_m}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the latter inequality and using the submartingale property we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1&\le\left(1+\frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))}\right)\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_{n_m}}+g(\nu_{n_m}));T_g>\nu_{n_m},\nu_{n_m}\le n_{m-1}]\\
&\le\left(1+\frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))}\right)\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}}+g(n_{m-1}));T_g>n_{m-1}].
\end{aligned}$$

As a result we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m));T_g>n_m]\\
&\qquad\le\left(1+\frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))}\right)\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}}+g(n_{m-1}));T_g>n_{m-1}]\\
&\qquad\qquad+\left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m}n_m))+2h(g(n_m))\right)/n_m^3.
\end{aligned}$$

Iterating this procedure m times we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m}+g(n_m));T_g>n_m]\le\prod_{j=1}^{m}\left(1+\frac{h(g(n_j))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j}n_j))}\right)$$
$$\times\left(\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_0}+g(n_0));T_g>n_0]+\sum_{j=1}^{m}\left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j}n_j))+2h(g(n_j))\right)/n_j^3\right).$$

Now note (20) implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\frac{h(g(n_j))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j}n_j))}<\infty.$$

Therefore, the product

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\infty}\left(1+\frac{h(g(n_j))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j}n_j))}\right)$$

is finite. Furthermore, recalling that the index of h is $\alpha(1-\rho)$, we conclude that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j}n_j))+2h(g(n_j))}{n_j^3}<\infty.$$

Then the statement of the proposition immediately follows.

□

3.2. **Derivation of the asymptotics.** In the proof of (11) we will require the following result.

Lemma 12. *Let S_n be asymptotically stable random walk. Then,*

$$\mathbf{P}(T_x>n)\sim h(x)n^{\rho-1}L(n) \tag{28}$$

uniformly in x such that $x/c(n)\to 0$. In addition the following estimate is valid for all $x\ge 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_x>n)\le Ch(x)n^{\rho-1}L(n). \tag{29}$$

Proof. The first statement (28) is Corollary 3 of [5].

Denote

$$\sigma(x):=\min\left\{k\ge 1:\sum_{i=1}^{k}\chi_i>x\right\}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_x>n)\le\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\sigma(x)}\tau_k>n\right)\le\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\sigma(x)}\tau_k\wedge n>n\right)$$
$$\le\frac{\mathbf{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{\sigma(x)}\tau_k\wedge n\right]}{n}=\frac{\mathbf{E}\sigma(x)\mathbf{E}[T_0\wedge n]}{n},$$

where we applied the Wald's identity in the last step. Since the tail of T_0 is regularly varying of order $\rho-1\in(0,1)$, by the Tauberian theorem, $\mathbf{E}[T_0\wedge n]\sim\rho^{-1}n\mathbf{P}(\tau>n)$. Also note that $h(x)=\mathbf{E}\sigma(x)$. Hence, as $n\to\infty$, uniformly in x,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_x>n)\le(1+o(1))h(x)\rho^{-1}\mathbf{P}(T_0>n).$$

□

According to (20),

$$\int_x^{2x} \frac{h(g(y))}{yh(c(y/\log y))}dy \to 0 \quad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

Since functions $c(x)$ $h(x)$, $g(x)$ are increasing and h, c are in addition regularly varying, we conclude that

$$\frac{h(g(x))}{h(c(x/\log x)} \to 0.$$

In other words,

$$g(x) = o(c(x/\log x)).$$

Consequently, there exists a sequence $\delta_n \to 0$ such that

$$g(n) = o(c(\delta_n n/\log n)).$$

Moreover, we may asume that δ_n is such that slowly varying functions in $\mathbf{P}(\tau > n) \sim n^{\rho-1}L(n)$ and $h(x) = x^{\alpha(1-\rho)}l(x)$ are such that $l(\delta_n n) \sim l(n)$ and $L(\delta_n n) \sim L(n)$.

Applying Lemma 10 with $\delta = \delta_n$ and $\varepsilon_n = \delta_n/(2C\log n)$, we get

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) = \mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n < n\delta_n) + o(n^{-2}). \tag{30}$$

This immediately gives us the bound from above. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)\\
&\le \int_{\varepsilon c_{n\delta_n}}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{y+g(n)} > n - n\delta_n)\\
&\le C\int_{\varepsilon c_{n\delta_n}}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)h(y+g(n))(n-n\delta_n)^{\rho-1}L(n-n\delta_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where we applied (29) in the last step. Now note that, uniformly in $y > c(\delta_n n/\log n)$, $h(y+g(n)) \sim h(y)$ and $(n-n\delta_n)^{\rho-1}L(n-n\delta_n) \sim n^{\rho-1}L(n)$. Therefore, for large n we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n < n\delta_n) &\le C\int_{\varepsilon c_{n\delta_n}}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)h(y)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)\\
&\le C\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); T_g > \nu_n, \nu_n \le n\delta_n]\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n).
\end{aligned}$$

By the submartingale property and Proposition 11,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); T_g > \nu_n, \nu_n \le n\delta_n] \le \mathbf{E}[h(S_{n\delta_n}); T_g > n\delta_n] \le V(g). \tag{31}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n < n\delta_n) \le CV(g)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n).$$

Combining this with (30), we get

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g > n) \le CV(g)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n). \tag{32}$$

Next we are going to improve the latter bound to obtain the sharp asymptotics. Let $A_n \uparrow \infty$ be such that $A_n c(\delta_n n/\log n) = o(c(n))$. Set, for brevity, $r_n := c(\delta_n n/\log n)$. We split the probability $\mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n \le \delta_n n)$ into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n \le \delta_n n) =& \mathbf{P}\left(T_g > n, \nu_n < \delta n, S_{\nu_n} \in (r_n, A_n r_n)\right)\\
&+ \mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n < \delta n, S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n).
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

For the first term we are gong to apply (28). We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}\left(T_g > n, \nu_n < \delta n, S_{\nu_n} \in (r_n, A_n r_n)\right) \\
&\quad \le \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{y+g(n)} > n - n\delta_n) \\
&\quad \sim \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)h(y)\mathbf{P}\{T_0 > n\} \\
&\quad \le \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); T_g > \nu_n, \nu_n \le n\delta_n]\mathbf{P}\{T_0 > n\} \\
&\quad \le V(g)\mathbf{P}\{T_0 > n\}, \qquad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (31) in the last step. The bound from below can be obtained by similar arguments:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}\left(T_g > n, \nu_n < \delta n, S_{\nu_n} \in (r_n, A_n r_n)\right) \\
&\quad \ge \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_y > n - n\delta_n) \\
&\quad \sim \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)h(y)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n) \\
&\quad = \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); T_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} < A_n r_n, \nu_n \le n\delta_n]\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n). \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we turn to the second term in (33). Using the Markov property and (28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}(T_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, T_g > \nu_n) \\
&\qquad\qquad \le C\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, T_g > \nu_n]\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n).
\end{aligned}$$

So we are left to prove that

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, T_g > \nu_n] \to 0. \qquad (36)$$

Now note that $S_{\nu_n - 1} \le r_n$. Then on the event $\{S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n\}$ we have

$$X_{\nu_n} > (A_n - 1)r_n > A_n r_n/2 > S_{\nu_n - 1}.$$

Hence

$$S_{\nu_n} = X_{\nu_n} + S_{\nu_n - 1} \le 2X_{\nu_n}.$$

Using the subadditivity and monotone increase of h we obtain

$$h(S_{\nu_n}) \le h(2X_{\nu_n}) \le 2h(X_{\nu_n}).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
E &:= \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, T_g > \nu_n] \\
&\le 2\mathbf{E}[h(X_{\nu_n}); X_{\nu_n} > (A_n/2)r_n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, T_g > \nu_n] \\
&\le \sum_{k=1}^{\delta_n n} \mathbf{E}[h(X_k); X_k > (A_n/2)r_n, \nu_n = k, T_g > k] \\
&\le 2\sum_{k=1}^{\delta_n n} \mathbf{P}(T_g \ge k)\mathbf{E}[h(X); X > (A_n/2)c_{n\delta_n}]
\end{aligned}$$

Applying (32), we obtain

$$E \le C\sum_{k=1}^{\delta_n n}\mathbf{P}(T_0\ge k)\mathbf{E}[h(X); X > (A_n/2)r_n]$$
$$\le C\delta_n n\mathbf{P}(T_0>\delta_n n)\mathbf{E}[h(X); X > (A_n/2)r_n].$$

Recall that if $X\in\mathcal{D}(\alpha,\beta)$ then the distribution function of $\theta(du) := u^2\mathbf{P}(|X|\in du)$ is regularly varying with index $2-\alpha$, that is,

$$\Theta(x) := \theta((0,x)) = x^{2-\alpha}\ell(x).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(X); X > (A_n/2)r_n] \le \int_{(A_n/2)r_n}^{\infty}\frac{h(x)}{x^2}\theta(dx) \le C\frac{h(A_nr_n)}{(A_nr_n)^2}\Theta(A_nr_n).$$

We can choose A_n in such a way that

$$\frac{h(A_nr_n)}{(A_nr_n)^2}\Theta(A_nr_n)\sim\left(\frac{c(n)}{A_nr_n}\right)^{\alpha\rho}\frac{h(c(n))}{c^2(n)}\Theta(c(n)).$$

Consequently,

$$E\le C\delta_n^{\rho}n\mathbf{P}(T_0>n)\left(\frac{c(n)}{A_nr_n}\right)^{\alpha\rho}\frac{h(c(n))}{c^2(n)}\Theta(c(n)).$$

Now recall that

$$h(c_n)\mathbf{P}(T_0>n)\to C_0,\quad n\frac{\Theta(c(n)}{c^2(n)}\to 1$$

for some constant C_0. Hence, for an appropriate choice of A_n,

$$E\le C\delta_n^{\rho}\left(\frac{c(n)}{A_nr_n}\right)^{\alpha\rho}\to 0$$

as $n\to\infty$. This completes the proof of (36).

Noting that (36) yields

$$\mathbf{P}(T_g>n,\nu_n<\delta_n n, S_{\nu_n}>A_nr_n, T_g>\nu_n) = o(\mathbf{P}(T_0>n))$$

and taking into account (34), we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\mathbf{P}(T_g>n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0>n)}\le V(g). \tag{37}$$

Combining (35) and (36), we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\mathbf{P}(T_g>n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0>n)}\ge\liminf_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); T_g>\nu_n,\nu_n\le n\delta_n]. \tag{38}$$

It follows from Lemma 10 with $\delta=\delta_n$ and $\varepsilon_n=\delta_n/(2C\log n)$ that

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\delta_n n}+g(\delta_n n)); T_g>\delta_n n,\nu_n>n\delta_n]\le g(c(n))\mathbf{P}(\nu_n>n\delta_n)\to 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); T_g>\nu_n,\nu_n\le n\delta_n] = \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n}+g(\theta_n)); T_g>\theta_n]+o(1),$$

where $\theta_n := \nu_n\wedge\delta_n n$. Applying the optional stopping theorem to the submartingale $h(S_n+g(n))1\{T_g>n\}$, we get, for every fixed N,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n}+g(\theta_n)); T_g>\theta_n]\ge\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n\wedge N}+g(\theta_n\wedge N)); T_g>\theta_n\wedge N].$$

Note also that

$$\Big|\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n\wedge N}+g(\theta_n\wedge N));T_g>\theta_n\wedge N,\nu_n<N] \\ -\mathbf{E}[h(S_N+g(N));T_g>N,\nu_n<N]\Big| \\ \le \mathbf{E}[h(\max_{k<N}|S_k|+g(N));\max_{k<N}|S_k|>c(\delta_n n/\log n)]\to 0.$$

As a result,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n}+g(\theta_n));T_g>\theta_n]\ge \mathbf{E}[h(S_N+g(N));T_g>N]+o(1)$$

and, consequently,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n});T_g>\nu_n,\nu_n\le n\delta_n]\ge \mathbf{E}[h(S_N+g(N));T_g>N].$$

Letting $N\to\infty$ we get

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n});T_g>\nu_n,\nu_n\le n\delta_n]\ge V(g).$$

Combining this with (37), we complete the proof of Theorem 5.

4. Proof of Theorem 7

The proof follows closely the proof of Theorem 5.

4.1. Positivity of $\widehat{V}(g)$.

Lemma 13. *The sequence $Y_n=h(S_n-g(n))1\{\widehat{T}_g>n\}$ is a supermartingale.*

Proof. Clearly,

$$\mathbf{E}\left[Y_{n+1}-Y_n|\mathcal{F}_n\right]=\mathbf{E}\left[\left(h(S_{n+1}-g(n+1))-h(S_n-g(n))\right)1\{\widehat{T}_g>n\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ -\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n+1}-g(n+1))1\{\widehat{T}_g=n+1\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right].$$

Now note that $h(S_{n+1}-g(n+1))1\{\widehat{T}_g=n+1\}=0$ since $h(x)=0$ for $x\le 0$. Next, by harmonicity of h

$$\mathbf{E}\left[Y_{n+1}-Y_n|\mathcal{F}_n\right] \\ =\mathbf{E}\left[\left(h(S_{n+1}-g(n+1))\right)1\{\widehat{T}_g>n\}|\mathcal{F}_n\right]-h(S_n-g(n))1\{\widehat{T}_g>n\} \\ =h(S_n-g(n+1))1\{\widehat{T}_g>n\}-h(S_n-g(n))1\{\widehat{T}_g>n\}\le 0,$$

since h and g are monotone increasing. □

By this supermartingale property, the limit $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{E}[h(S_n-g(n);\widehat{T}_g>n]$ exists and is finite. Thus, we need to show that this limit is positive.

Proposition 14. *Assume that g is such that $g(0)>0$ and condition (12) holds. Then there exists a strictly positive and finite limit*

$$\widehat{V}(g):=\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{E}\left[h(S(n)-g(n));\widehat{T}_g>n\right].$$

Proof. Since $h(S(n)-g(n))1\{\widehat{T}_g > n\}$ is a supermartingale it is sufficient to show that

$$\inf_n \mathbf{E}\left[h(S(n)-g(n)); \widehat{T}_g > n\right] > 0.$$

Fix some $n_0 > 1$ and define

$$n_m = n_0[(1/\delta)^m], \quad m \geq 1,$$

where $[r]$ denotes the integer part of r. Since $\mathbf{E}[h(S_n - g(n)); \widehat{T}_g > n]$ is decreasing, it suffices to show that $\inf_m \mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m)); \widehat{T}_g > n_m] > 0$. First

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m)); \widehat{T}_g > n_m] &\geq E_1 \\ &:= \mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m)); \widehat{T}_g > n_m, \nu_{n_m} \leq n_{m-1}\right].\end{aligned}$$

For fixed n let

$$\widetilde{\tau}(g(n)) := \min\{k \geq 1 : S_k - g(n) \leq 0\}.$$

Then

$$E_1 = \mathbf{E}\left[\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m))1\{\widehat{T}_g > n_m\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\nu_{n_m}}\right], \nu_{n_m} \leq n_{m-1}\right].$$

Then, again, using the harmonicity of h,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m))1\{\widehat{T}_g > n_m\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\nu_{n_m}}\right] \\ &\quad \geq \mathbf{E}_{S_{\nu_{n_m}}}[h(S_{n_m - \nu_{n_m}} - g(n_m))1\{\widetilde{\tau}(g(n_m)) > n_m - \nu_{n_m}\}]1\{\widehat{T}_g > \nu_{n_m}\} \\ &\quad \geq h(S_{\nu_{n_m}} - g(n_m))1\{\widehat{T}_g > \nu_{n_m}\} \\ &\quad \geq \left(h(S_{\nu_{n_m}} - g(\nu_{n_m})) - h(g(n_m))\right)1\{\widehat{T}_g > \nu_{n_m}\},\end{aligned}$$

where we used the subadditivity of h in the latter inequality. Now since $S_{\nu_n} \geq c(\varepsilon_n n)$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{E}\left[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m))1\{\widehat{T}_g > n_m\} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\nu_{n_m}}\right] \\ &\qquad \geq h(S_{\nu_{n_m}} - g(\nu_{n_m}))\left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))}\right)1\{\widehat{T}_g > \nu_{n_m}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the latter inequality and using the submartingale property we have,

$$\begin{aligned}E_1 &\geq \left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))}\right)\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_{n_m}} - g(\nu_{n_m})); \widehat{T}_g > \nu_{n_m}, \nu_{n_m} \leq n_{m-1}] \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))}\right)\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}} - g(n_{m-1})); \widehat{T}_g > n_{m-1}, \nu_{n_m} \leq n_{m-1}] \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))}\right)\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}} - g(n_{m-1})); \widehat{T}_g > n_{m-1}] \\ &\quad - \mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}} - g(n_{m-1})); \widehat{T}_g > n_{m-1}, \nu_{n_m} > n_{m-1}].\end{aligned}$$

Now note

$$\begin{aligned}E_2 &:= \mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}}) - g(n_{m-1}))); \widehat{T}_g > n_{m-1}, \nu_{n_m} > n_{m-1}] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}\left[h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m)); \nu_{n_m} > n_{m-1}\right] \\ &\leq \left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))\right)\mathbf{P}(\nu_{n_m} > n_{m-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 9 with $\varepsilon_n := (3\delta C \log n)^{-1}$, we obtain

$$E_2 \le (h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))n_m^{-3}.$$

As a result we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m)); \widehat{T}_g > n_m] \\ \ge \left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_m))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))}\right) \mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_{m-1}} - g(n_{m-1})); \widehat{T}_g > n_{m-1}] \\ - \left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_m} n_m))\right)/n_m^3.\end{aligned}$$

Iterating this procedure m times we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_m} - g(n_m)); \widehat{T}_g > n_m] \ge \prod_{j=1}^{m} \left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_j))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j} n_j))}\right) \\ \times \left(\mathbf{E}[h(S_{n_0} + g(n_0)); \widehat{T}_g > n_0] - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j} n_j))\right)/n_j^3\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now note (20) implies that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(g(n_j))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j} n_j))} < \infty.$$

Therefore, the product

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{h(g(n_j))}{h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j} n_j))}\right)$$

is finite. Furthermore, recalling that the index of h is $\alpha(1-\rho)$, we conclude that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(h(c(\varepsilon_{n_j} n_j))}{n_j^3} < \infty.$$

Then the statement of the proposition immediately follows.

□

4.2. **Derivation of the asymptotics.** In this case the upper bound is obvious

$$\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n) \le \mathbf{P}(T_0 > n). \tag{39}$$

According to (20),

$$\int_x^{2x} \frac{h(g(y))}{y h(c(y/\log y))} dy \to 0 \quad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

Since functions $c(x)$ $h(x)$, $g(x)$ are increasing and h, c are in addition regularly varying, we conclude that

$$\frac{h(g(x))}{h(c(x/\log x)} \to 0.$$

In other words,

$$g(x) = o(c(x/\log x)).$$

Consequently, there exists a sequence $\delta_n \to 0$ such that

$$g(n) = o(c(\delta_n n/\log n)).$$

Moreover, we may asume that δ_n is such that slowly varying functions in $\mathbf{P}(\tau > n) \sim n^{\rho-1}L(n)$ and $h(x) = x^{\alpha(1-\rho)}l(x)$ are such that $l(\delta_n n) \sim l(n)$ and $L(\delta_n n) \sim L(n)$.

Applying Lemma 10 with $\delta = \delta_n$ and $\varepsilon_n = \delta_n/(2C\log n)$, we get

$$\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n) = \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < n\delta_n) + o(n^{-2}). \tag{40}$$

Let $A_n \uparrow \infty$ be such that $A_n c(\delta_n n/\log n) = o(c(n))$. Set, for brevity, $r_n := c(\delta_n n/\log n)$. We split the probability $\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n \le \delta_n n)$ into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n \le \delta_n n) =& \mathbf{P}\left(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} \in (r_n, A_n r_n)\right) \\ &+ \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n).\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

For the first term we are gong to apply (28). We have,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}\left(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} \in (r_n, A_n r_n)\right) \\ &\quad\le \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_y > n - n\delta_n) \\ &\quad\sim \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)h(y)\mathbf{P}\{T_0 > n\} \\ &\quad\le \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n]\mathbf{P}\{T_0 > n\} \\ &\quad\sim \widehat{V}(g)\mathbf{P}\{T_0 > n\}.\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

The bound from below can be obtained by similar arguments:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}\left(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} \in (r_n, A_n r_n)\right) \\ &\ge \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)\mathbf{P}(\widetilde{\tau}_{y-g(n)} > n - n\delta_n) \\ &\sim \int_{r_n}^{A_n r_n} \mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} \in dy, \nu_n \le n\delta_n)h(y)\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n) \\ &= \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, S_{\nu_n} < A_n r_n, \nu_n \le n\delta_n]\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n).\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Now we turn to the second term in (41). Using the Markov property and (28), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n) \\ &\qquad\le C\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n]\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n).\end{aligned}$$

So we are left to prove that

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n] \to 0. \tag{44}$$

But this immediately follows from (36) since $\widehat{T}_g \le T_g$.

Noting that (44) yields

$$\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n, \nu_n < \delta_n n, S_{\nu_n} > A_n r_n, \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n) = o(\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n))$$

and taking into account (42), we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} \le \widehat{V}(g). \tag{45}$$

Combining (43) and (44), we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}(\widehat{T}_g > n)}{\mathbf{P}(T_0 > n)} \geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, \nu_n \leq n\delta_n]. \tag{46}$$

It follows from Lemma 10 with $\delta = \delta_n$ and $\varepsilon_n = \delta_n/(2C\log n)$ that

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\delta_n n} - g(\delta_n n)); \widehat{T}_g > \delta_n n, \nu_n > n\delta_n] \leq g(c(n))\mathbf{P}(\nu_n > n\delta_n) \to 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\nu_n}); \widehat{T}_g > \nu_n, \nu_n \leq n\delta_n] = \mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n} - g(\theta_n)); \widehat{T}_g > \theta_n] + o(1),$$

where $\theta_n := \nu_n \wedge \delta_n n$. Applying the optional stopping theorem to the supermartingale $h(S_n - g(n))1\{\widehat{T}_g > n\}$, we get,

$$\mathbf{E}[h(S_{\theta_n} - g(\theta_n)); \widehat{T}_g > \theta_n] \geq \widehat{V}(g).$$

Combining this with (45), we complete the proof of Theorem 7.

References

[1] Afanasyev V.I., Geiger J., Kersting G and Vatutin V.A. Criticality for branching processes in random environment. *Ann. Probab.*, **33**:645-673, 2005.

[2] Aurzada F. and Kramm T. The first passage time problem over a moving boundary for asymptotically stable Lévy processes arXiv:1305.1203.

[3] Aurzada F., Kramm T., and Savov M. First passage times of Lévy processes over a one-sided moving boundary. arXiv:1201.1118.

[4] Denisov D. and Wachtel V. Random walks in cones. *To appear in Ann. Probab.* arXiv:1110.1254.

[5] Doney, R.A. Local behaviour of first passage probabilities. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **152**:559–588, 2012.

[6] Erickson, K.B. The strong law of large numbers when the mean is undefined. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **185**:371-381, 1973.

[7] Feller W. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications.* V.2, Willey, New York-London-Sydney-Toronto, 1971.

[8] Greenwood, P.E. and Monroe, I. Random stopping preserves regular variation of process distribution. *Ann. Probab.*, **5**:42-51, 1977.

[9] Greenwood, P.E. and Novikov, A.A. One-sided boundary crossing for processes with independent increments. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **31**(2):221-232, 1987.

[10] Hambly, B.M., Kersting G. and Kyprianou, A.E. Law of the iterated logarithm for oscillating random walks conditioned to stay positive. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*,**108**:327-343, 2003.

[11] Mogulskii, A.A. and Pecherskii, E.A. Time of first entry into a region with curved boundary. *Siberian Math. J.*, **19**:582-595, 1979.

[12] Novikov, A.A. The martingale approach in problems on the time of the first crossing of nonlinear boundaries. (Russian) *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov.* **158**:130-152, 1981.

[13] Novikov, A.A. On the moment of crossing the one-sided nonlinear boundary by sums of independent random variables. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **27**:688-702, 1983.

[14] Uchiyama, K. Brownian first exit from and sojourn over one-sided moving boundary and application. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete*, **54**:75-116, 1980.

School of Mathematics, University of Manchester, UK
E-mail address: denis.denisov@manchester.ac.uk

Mathematical Institute, University of Munich, Theresienstrasse 39, D–80333 Munich, Germany
E-mail address: wachtel@mathematik.uni-muenchen.de